



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,226	09/16/2003	John R. Boehringer	B1256/20003 (11)	2118
3000	7590	07/10/2008		
CAESAR, RIVISE, BERNSTEIN, COHEN & POKOTILOW, LTD. 11TH FLOOR, SEVEN PENN CENTER 1635 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2212				
			EXAMINER	
			HAND, MELANIE JO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3761	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/10/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@crbcp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/663,226	BOEHRINGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MELANIE J. HAND	3761	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-33 and 35-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-22,30-33,35-38,40-42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 23-29 and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 23-29 and 39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection prompted by applicant's amendment to the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 23 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Svedman (U.S. Patent No. 5,358,494).

With respect to **claim 23**: Svedman teaches a medical device for treating a wound. With regard to (a), the method comprises suction means for applying suction to the wound in the form of a syringe 12. With regard to the limitation "suction means for applying suction to the wound" applicant has disclosed a wall suction device or portable suction pump for applying suction interpreted herein as the means for applying suction. Svemdan teaches a portable suction pump in the form of syringe 12. (Col. 3, lines 35-39) With regard to the limitation "to facilitate contraction of the wound", since Svedman teaches a suction means that anticipates the claimed suction means for applying suction, the suction means of Svedman is fully capable of facilitating

contraction of the wound. With regard to (b), Svedman teaches an enclosure formed by flexible plate 1. The enclosure of Svedman engages the skin around the wound via adhesive layer 3, thus necessarily maintaining suction on the wound by engaging the skin around the wound. (Fig. 1, Col. 2, lines 34-38) With regard to (c), Svedman teaches an anisotropic wound packing means in the form of a flexible pad 11 for placement in the wound. Pad 11 comprises a cylindrical piece of synthetic fabric which is considered herein to be anisotropic as it is considerably more difficult to contract a roll of fabric via suction in directions that are orthogonal to the direction of suction flow. (Col. 2, lines 56-58) Thus, wound packing 11 has at least one predetermined direction of preferential contraction in response to suction, i.e. the direction parallel to the direction of suction flow. With regard to the limitation “treating a wound by controlling the direction of wound contraction”, Svedman anticipates the limitations of claim 23 as to an anisotropic wound packing and suction means. A wound will necessarily contract only as quickly as the packing filling the wound and removing fluid therefrom is not obstructing the tissue, thus controlling the direction of contraction of the packing by providing an anisotropic packing and applying suction will necessarily control the direction of wound contraction. Thus, the device of Svedman is fully capable of treating a wound by controlling the direction of wound contraction.

With respect to **claim 27**: The phrase “generally spirally wound” is not clearly and explicitly defined in the disclosure by applicant. Thus the claim is given its broadest reasonable interpretation. The generally cylindrical gauze roll suggested by Svedman is considered herein to be generally spirally wound inasmuch as it is formed by winding the fabric at least once to form the cylinder. Thus, the device of Svedman renders the limitation “said packing comprises at least one generally spirally wound gauze roll” obvious.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
4. Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Svedman (U.S. Patent No. 5,358,494).

With respect to **claim 24**: Svedman teaches that the packing comprises a cylindrical piece of synthetic fabric. Svedman does not explicitly teach gauze. However it is well known in the art to roll up gauze into a cylindrical configuration and place it in a wound to absorb wound exudate. Therefore, it would be obvious to modify the device of Svedman such that the cylindrical piece of synthetic fabric is a roll of gauze with a reasonable expectation of success to facilitate healing of a wound by absorbing wound exudate.

With respect to **claim 25**: The packing means fairly suggested by Svedman comprises at least one generally cylindrical gauze roll necessarily having a generally longitudinal axis and radial axes. The longitudinal axis of the roll will necessarily face outwardly from the wound and the radial axes of the roll will necessarily face sides of the wound, regardless of the position in which the roll is oriented within the wound. The motivation to modify the device of Svedman such that the wound packing is a cylindrical piece of gauze is stated *supra* with respect to claim 24.

With respect to **claim 26**: Svedman does not explicitly teach that the packing comprises a plurality of said cylindrical gauze rolls to be disposed with their respective longitudinal axes generally parallel to each other in the wound. However, a plurality of rolls would accomplish the same result as one roll. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Svedman such that the packing 11 comprises a plurality of identical gauze rolls identical to the first roll suggested by Svedman with a reasonable expectation of success to provide an effective means of packing a wound. It has been held that the mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St Regis paper Co. v. Bemis. Co.* 193 USPQ 8 (7th Cir. 1977) Thus the device suggested by Svedman renders the limitation "to be disposed with their respective longitudinal axes generally parallel to each other in the wound" obvious. Further this limitation is directed to a method of using the packing that bears little patentable weight herein, as claim 26 is directed to an article.

5. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Svedman ('494) in view of Zamierowski (U.S. Patent No. 4,969,880).

With respect to **claim 28**: Svedman teaches a portable suction means, "e.g. a syringe", but does not explicitly teach a flexible bulb. Zamierowski teaches a wound treatment device comprising an apparatus adapted for manual compression, comprising a flexible bulb 42, with an inlet conduit in the form of suction tube 41 connecting the bulb 42 to the wound enclosure 22 and an outlet conduit 34 connecting the bulb to discharge in the form of pumping medication to wound site 12. Since a flexible bulb and a syringe are both equally effective and equally well known portable means for applying suction, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Svedman so as to replace the syringe with a flexible bulb with a reasonable expectation of success to provide an equally effective portable source of suction to allow the device to be used in more various ways and locations.

6. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Svedman ('494) in view of Zamierowski ('880), as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of McNeil (U.S. Patent No. 4,551,141).

With respect to **claim 29**: Svedman does not teach a flexible bulb. Zamierowski teaches a flexible bulb but does not teach spring means inside the bulb. McNeil teaches that springs are an equivalent means of generating suction to bellows and bulbs in portable drainage devices, both of which are also taught by Zamierowski. Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the suction means of the combined teaching of Svedman and Zamierowski so as to have a bulb with a spring means inside to supplement the suction-generating capability of the bulb as taught by McNeil. The limitation of "for providing resistance to rapid decay of suction in the bulb" constitutes functional language that is given little patentable weight herein. ('141, Col. 6, lines 59-62) The combined teaching of Svedman and

Zamierowski and McNeil renders all of the remaining limitations of claim 29 obvious and thus is fully capable of providing resistance to rapid decay of suction in the bulb.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELANIE J. HAND whose telephone number is (571)272-6464. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 8:00-5:30, alternate Fridays 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tatyana Zalukaeva can be reached on 571-272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Melanie J Hand/
Examiner, Art Unit 3761

/Tatyana Zalukaeva/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3761